Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/059,978	BUBB ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marianne L. Padgett	1762
All Participants: Status of Application: after abandonment date		
(1) Marianne L. Padgett.	(3)	
(2) <u>George Kap</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>4 March 2005</u>	Time: afternoon	1
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: N/A		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		•
Part II.		•
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
		·
		•
$A \mathcal{D}_{2}$		
MARIANNE PADGETT PRIMARY EXAMINER		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Sig	nature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner inquired about particulars of 1/27/05 letter & misnumbered after final amendment. The paper was not in the scanned file of the incorrect serial #. Mr.Kap offered to & FAXed a copy of the missing paper, but the examiner informed him that she probably could not use it, because it needed to be scanned & processed before she was allowed to act on it, but she would enquire as to what could be done. The results of her enquiries were left as a message: As it was applicant error (wrong serial # 09/996,736) & no amendment was received in the present file (10/059,978) before abandonment date, the paper could not be considered timely, hence could not be entered. The examiner was advised that applicant's best recourse would probably involve petitioning for unintentional abandonment.